



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

his earnestness? The argument of Schwartzkopff at this point does not convince us. But thoughtful students of the New Testament will find the book, as a whole, well worthy their careful reading.

E. D. B.

The Veracity of the Hexateuch. A Defense of the Historic Character of the First Six Books of the Bible. By SAMUEL COLCORD BARTLETT, D.D., LL.D., ex-President of Dartmouth College. Chicago, New York, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. Pp. xi+404, 8vo. Cloth, \$1.

One cannot help feeling admiration in opening a book in which an octogenarian has recorded the results of many years' successful study of the Old Testament, with reference to much of the latest literature. Evidently like Moses, of whom he writes, his eye is not dim nor his natural force abated.

Every evangelical scholar must be in heartiest sympathy with the object of the book. He writes for the edification of those who cannot accept the Hexateuch as possessing divine authority unless its veracity in fact, as well as in intent, as a record of actual events can be established.

It is difficult to change habits of the body, but much more difficult to change those of the mind, especially if they have to do with the most sacred convictions. Many a man feels as mournfully with regard to the new criticism as Mary with respect to the removal of the body of Jesus: "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." But the church must reach the position where it will hold that criticism can no more take away the fact that the Old Testament is a record of God's ancient revelation to Israel than that any human power could fetter the movements of the resurrection body of Jesus. While it is well to show confirmations of biblical records, it is not well to lead the church to pin its faith to such confirmations. The unique authority of Christ and his office as the Savior of men does not depend on the literal accuracy of the first three chapters of Genesis as sober history, nor on the accuracy of every detail in the first six books. It is hurtful to make claims that cannot be held regarding the origin and composition of the Hexateuch. The chief defect of Dr. Bartlett's book is in using arguments and drawing conclusions that cannot stand. I quite agree with Dr. Bartlett that the tendency of the present literary criticism, as applied to the parti-

tion of the documents, is to a *reductio ad absurdum*. But it must be remembered that the literary criticism of the Hexateuch is not to be judged merely by logical formulæ, but by the ascertainment of facts. Facts, once established, cannot be disproved by the follies or extravagances of investigators. Even such conservative scholars as Hommel and Klostermann admit the existence of different documents in the Hexateuch. Such an admission seems to be a necessity in the light of modern investigations. Dr. Green's recent volumes, which Dr. Bartlett considers easier to ignore than to answer, keen as they are, have not overthrown the main features of the analysis, since many explanations are required for the contrary contention where the one theory of different documents suffices.

Furthermore, the principle claimed that, since tests made of three-fourths of the narrative from Jesus to Joshua are favorable to its authenticity, the remaining fourth must also be authentic, is not in itself a good argument when we remember that modern investigation has shown that the earliest chapters of ancient national history are mythical. Of course, Dr. Bartlett might say that the Old Testament is on an entirely different plane as a divine book, but he does not distinctly make this claim.

The brief discussion of the priesthood and the codes near the end of the volume does not strengthen the book. The codes, so diverse from each other in many particulars, furnish the most difficult problem to the traditionalist, who ascribes their origin to one man in less than forty years, under the stationary conditions of ancient society. Dr. Bartlett says that Moses would see the necessity of such exact prescriptions at the very beginning of Israel's history. But according to the history and the testimony of the Old Testament itself, the great bulk of the priestly statutes were without force until the time of Ezra.

Dr. Bartlett does not too strongly condemn the view that the laws gathered in the Pentateuch under the name of Moses were a forgery. We may rather suppose that they arose as occasion required on the basis of ancient Mosaic law, and were finally written down in that collection which bore his name, as the collection of psalms bore the name of David, and Proverbs that of Solomon. But the conclusion toward which Dr. Bartlett's discussion seems to aim, that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch largely in its present form, is not justified.

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS.